

be forever intertwined with the history of Israel. As a general, he led the heroic effort to secure Israel's existence. As a statesman, he made the historic decision to seek peace for his nation. Only a man who so fully understood the struggle to create a secure and democratic Israel could seize the moment to pursue peace.

It is tragically fitting that Prime Minister Rabin's last act was to speak in support of the peace process—a difficult yet vital process to which he devoted the past 2 years of his life.

I can add little to the words Yitzhak Rabin spoke on his last day. He said: "I was a military man for 27 years. I waged war as long as there was no chance for peace. I believe there is now a chance for peace, a great chance, and we must take advantage of it for those who are standing here, and for those who are not here—and they are many. I have always believed that the majority of the people want peace and are ready to take a chance for peace."

Yitzhak Rabin has done as much as anyone to build the Jewish state, defend it in time of need, and foster relationships with Israel's neighbors so that future generations will know peace instead of war. We mourn the loss of Yitzhak Rabin and pray that his life's work may continue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

CALLING FOR ABOLITION OF ELECTORAL COLLEGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, 1 year from now, 1 year from this week, the entire Nation will be watching the results of the 1996 presidential election. As 1992 had a lot of suspense to it, including three candidates, 1996 could be a real roller coaster ride.

That is why I am introducing legislation today that would amend the Constitution of the United States to do away with the Electoral College and the winner-take-all system that says that a presidential candidate who wins even by 1 percent of the votes in a State therefore takes all the electoral votes in that State.

The reason I am calling to do away with the Electoral College is because I think 1 year from today we should not have the kind of possible suspenseful outcome that could happen. Because, Mr. Speaker, 1 year from today, as I read the newspapers and as I look at the tea leaves, we could have as many as four presidential candidates on the ballot.

We could have the Democratic nominee, presumably William Clinton. We

could have the Republican nominee. We could have the Independent United We Stand nominee, Ross Perot or someone else. I have heard talk of Jesse Jackson running as an Independent candidate. And who knows who else that may be running and winning a significant number of votes? As the system stands, if there is no one that is a clear winner in the Electoral College, then that election comes to the House of Representatives.

In 1992, if that had been the outcome, I suspect that the Republican candidate would have been concerned about coming into the House of Representatives, which was controlled by the Democratic Party. And so in 1996 it is fair to say the Democratic candidate may have some hesitation about coming to the House of Representatives controlled by the Republican Party. But I will tell you who really ought to be upset, would be an Independent candidate who has to come to a House that they do not have any votes, Republican or Democrat, in.

Why do we not end this anachronism, this vestige of the past, this Electoral College, by simply saying that the candidate that gets over 40 percent of the vote, the popular vote, is the winner. And indeed, if no candidate gets 40 percent of the vote, then the top two vote-getters have a runoff until one wins. That is what the American people deserve.

Some will say, well, if you do away with the Electoral College, this winner-take-all system whereby, if a presidential candidate gets 1 more vote in the State of West Virginia than the other candidates, that presidential candidate takes all 5 of our State's electoral votes, or if they get 1 more vote of the popular vote in the State of California, they get all 54 of those electoral votes, some say that small States may lose out on this. I do not buy that.

First of all, to be honest with you, presidential candidates do not drop in a great deal on us small States. They may fly through occasionally, have a tarmac press conference at the airport, but they are not spending a lot of time. They are going after the big populous States.

But the second thing is this. Why is it that if I vote and I vote for the winning candidate in West Virginia, my vote in effect is multiplied times five? My vote equals five electoral votes. But somebody with the winning candidate in California, their vote is multiplied by 54, the number of electors from California.

So for these reasons, I think it is essential that we make sure that the American public feels secure about the election process, and understands that it cannot be taken away and that the person who gets the most votes is the person who ends up being elected President; not the person getting the most votes, perhaps getting outdone and politically outmaneuvered in the House in a later election.

That is why I hope that we can pass this constitutional amendment to do away with the Electoral College once and for all. This is a college that ought to lose its certification.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. DIAZ-BALART addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mrs. SEASTRAND] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. SEASTRAND addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

TOLEDO COMMUNITY REMEMBERS AND PAYS TRIBUTE TO YITZHAK RABIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, last evening on November 6, the greater Toledo community gathered at Temple Shomer Emunim to pay tribute to the heroic life of Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin. Our citizenry humbly assembled—Jew, Muslim, Hindu, Christian, people of all faiths and denominations—to stand together as free people, of diverse heritage, to light candles of commemoration and of peace. Our people wished to demonstrate that here in the United States—a Nation dedicated to justice, human betterment, and "E Pluribus Unum"—One from many—we stand at one with people of peace, wherever they reside.

We witness through our unity as well as our deep sorrow that the hope for peace for which Prime Minister Rabin laid down his life will enlarge the resolve of the entire world to bring its human and spiritual resources to bear on the Middle East peace process. May the cause for which he so nobly shed his blood be sanctified.

The heartfelt remarks of Rabbi Alan Sokobin, cochair community relations of the Jewish Federation of Greater Toledo, delivered with eloquence, offered deep comfort and inspiration. Let them be inserted in this RECORD as historical evidence of the international understanding of our Toledo community and the deep desire of all our people for reconciliation.